	Case 5:11-cv-03493-LHK Document 40 Filed 10/10/12 Page 1 of 4
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	
8	
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	THESOLONIA BAKER,) No. C 11-3493 LHK (PR)
12	Plaintiff, ORDER OF SERVICE;
13	v. DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO FILE DISPOSITIVE MOTION
14	OR NOTICE REGARDING CORRECTIONAL OFFICER DUTRO, et) OR NOTICE REGARDING SUCH MOTION
15	
16	Defendants.) (Docket No. 39)
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a second amended civil rights
18	complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 challenging the conditions of his confinement at Pelican
19	Bay State Prison ("PBSP"). For the reasons stated below, the Court orders the second amended
20	complaint served upon named Defendants.
21	DISCUSSION
22	A. <u>Standard of Review</u>
23	A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner
24	seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See
25	28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the Court must identify any cognizable claims and dismiss
26	any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or
27	seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. §
28	1915A(b)(1), (2). <i>Pro se</i> pleadings must, however, be liberally construed. <i>See Balistreri v</i> .
	Order of Service; Directing Defendants to File Dispositive Motion or Notice Regarding Such Motion G:\PRO-SE\SJ.LHK\CR.11\Baker493srv2.wpd

1 | Pacifica Police Dep't., 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *See West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

B. <u>Plaintiff's Claims</u>

Plaintiff claims that during the month of Ramadan, and specifically from August 22, 2010, through August 30, 2010, Plaintiff was given rotten or spoiled eggs, which caused him to be sick. He further alleges that Defendants refused to help Plaintiff receive a replacement meal or remedy the problem. Liberally construed, Plaintiff's assertions are sufficient to state cognizable federal civil rights claims of violations of the Free Exercise Clause and the Eighth Amendment.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the court hereby orders as follows:

1. The Clerk of the Court shall mail a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summons, two copies of the Waiver of Service of Summons, a copy of the second amended complaint and all attachments thereto (docket no. 37), and a copy of this Order to Correctional Officer Dutro, Correctional Officer Estes, Correctional Officer Hutchison, Correctional Officer Drager, Correctional Officer Commons, Correctional Officer D. Hamilton, and Food Manager Lucy Sojka at Pelican Bay State Prison. The Clerk of the Court shall DISMISS G.D. Lewis, C. Patten, W. Reynolds, R. Cox, N. Threm, P. Wenning, D.W. Bradbury, and Orager.

The Clerk of the Court shall also mail a courtesy copy of the second amended complaint and a copy of this Order to the California Attorney General's Office. Additionally, the Clerk shall mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

2. Defendants are cautioned that Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires them to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. Pursuant to Rule 4, if Defendants, after being notified of this action and asked by the Court, on

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 3. No later than **ninety** (90) **days** from the date of this order, Defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the cognizable claim in the complaint.
- a. If Defendants elect to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), Defendants shall do so in an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion pursuant to *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003).
- b. Any motion for summary judgment shall be supported by adequate factual documentation and shall conform in all respects to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendants are advised that summary judgment cannot be granted, nor qualified immunity found, if material facts are in dispute. If Defendants are of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, they shall so inform the Court prior to the date the summary judgment motion is due.
- 4. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court and served on Defendants no later than **twenty-eight** (28) **days** from the date Defendants' motion is filed. Plaintiff is advised to read Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986) (holding party opposing summary judgment must come forward with evidence showing triable issues of material fact on every essential element of his claim).

- 5. Defendants <u>shall</u> file a reply brief no later than **fourteen (14) days** after Plaintiff's opposition is filed.
- 6. The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.
- 7. All communications by the Plaintiff with the Court must be served on Defendants or Defendants' counsel, by mailing a true copy of the document to Defendants or Defendants' counsel.
- 8. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

 No further Court order is required before the parties may conduct discovery.
- 9. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the Court and all parties informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

This order terminates docket number 39 as unnecessary.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 10/9/12

United States District Judge